Project Title

Operational Contracting Reengineering

Background

The Air Force Center for Quality & Management Innovation (AFCQMI) notified SAF/AQCO of the annual requirement to review Air Force Manpower Standard (AFMS) 12A0, Operational Contracting, for accuracy. With the functional's consent, AFCQMI solicited inputs from MAJCOM/XPMs, with coordination from contracting representatives. Emphasis was placed on applicability of core processes, manpower tables and applicability of variances. The results were packaged and forwarded to SAF/AQCO for action. Comments from field representatives questioned the relevancy of the AFMS.

As a result of the AFMS review, SAF/AQCO engaged AFCQMI, Headquarters Air Mobility Command (AMC) & Air Force Space Command (AFSPC) at Peterson AFB, CO to discuss a case for change. Problems identified included: the lack of a responsive workload factor (1992 Objective Wing - population), the need for a more flexible organizational structure, correlation of civilian grades to the complexity of work, Outsourcing & Privatization (O&P) future workload, 32 AFMS variances, the effects of acquisition reform, International Merchant Purchase Authorization Card (IMPAC)/Commodities, span of control and contingency requirements.

The Deputy Assistant Secretary (Contracting), SAF/AQC, determined the need for an independent assessment of Operational Contracting processes and associated manpower requirements. AFCQMI was contracted to partner with SAF/AQC to develop a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the organizations to plan a course of action.

Purpose

Create a flexible, streamlined Operational Contracting Squadron that measurably improves customer service and incorporates modern contracting methodologies, ensuring optimum value to the Air Force.

Methodology

The initial effort was to revise the Operational Contracting AFMS to compensate for near-term, incremental differences in workload changes, and expected workload increases in service-type contracts as a result of differing levels of O&P initiatives. The reengineering team focused its efforts on three variances: Contract Administration of A-76 Contracts, Quality Assurance Evaluator Program Coordinator (QAEPC) and IMPAC.

Concurrently with the AFMS revision phase and future phases, Operational Contracting is testing

and evaluating the success of organizational structures proposed by three MAJCOMs: HQ AMC, HQ AFSPC and HQ AFSOC. The test began in October 1997 and will continue through September 1998. Metric collection occurs on a quarterly basis to assess effectiveness of the organizations being tested as compared to a select group of control bases utilizing the original structure.

The next step was a comprehensive review of key contracting activities. The reengineering team was able to develop a strong current capability assessment along with the framework for an activity-based costing (ABC) model. This information was utilized to further develop organizational options to the vision outlined in "Contracting 21." The proposed organizational options, with a hierarchical analysis, will be presented to Operational Contracting senior leadership to decide which proposals warrant further analysis.

As a continuation to this step, the team is proposing an evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of key contracting processes and identification of reengineering opportunities. This goal will, most likely, require the use of benchmarking, flow process and data collection. Expected outcomes are business options with notional manpower determinants for each.

Developed options will be briefed through Air Force Corporate structure for approval. The approved organizational option with reengineered processes will require a follow-on manpower determinant workshop. A trial impact application by all MAJCOMs would be required to certify the draft AFMS before its final approval.

PROJECT

METHODOLOGY

Overview

The goals of the project, to this point, were tied to revision of the Operational Contracting AFMS. Specifics include: compensated for near-term incremental differences in workload, begin test and evaluation of new organizational structures, develop and implement an ABC model, conduct a current capability assessment, develop options for Contracting senior leadership decision and set milestones for the completion of the project.

Reengineering Team Establishment

A core team consisting of one representative from SAF/AQCO and three representatives from AFCQMI/MQAB were assigned to the project. Primary responsibilities of this team are as follows:

Maj Brian Magazu, Functional Action Officer, communicates senior leadership commitment to affected Operational Contracting personnel, identifies/notifies process experts who will participate for project duration, coordinates funding issues associated with the project, reviews and approves all products before staffing, and staffs results through Operational Contracting senior leadership.

1Lt Eric Meredith, Project Leader, coordinates with SAF/AQCO on all project issues, facilitates team meetings, determines TDY resource requirements, reviews all study products, assists with development of interim reports & the final report, assists with development of the AFMS, performs project manager/analyst duties in their absence and provides updates to AFCQMI leadership as needed.

2Lt Bill Eaton, Project Manager, collects required data via interviews, on-site observations, questionnaires, etc.; assists with analysis of collected data; conducts/facilitates workshops; assists with analyst duties as needed; and coordinates/reviews all study products with the project leader and project analyst.

SSgt Doug McCarroll, Study Analyst/Technographer; collects/compiles required data via interviews, on-site observations, questionnaires, etc.; analyzes collected data; facilitates workshops; performs project manager duties as needed; acts as focal point for all collected data/study products; utilizes Integrated Definition (IDEF) methodologies, benchmarking, simulation and other analytical tools required by the project; coordinates/reviews all study products with the project leader and project manager; and publishes all derivative products/AFMS.

Reengineering Action Teams

These three groups, composed of Operational Contracting personnel, were instituted to ensure proper dissemination of information to gain buy-in, demonstrate a clear chain of command for the project and assign taskings to appropriate working levels. The three tiers are: the Executive Steer-

ing Group (ESG), the MAJCOM Working Group and the Base Level Working Group. The responsibilities of these teams are as follows:
The Base Level Working Group, lead by a designated MAJCOM working group member, was designed to provide the field expertise needed to identify the activities and processes being performed by the Operational Contracting Squadrons. This group is also instrumental in providing feedback on operative issues to the MAJCOM working group and ESG.

The MAJCOM working group, chaired by, SAF/AQCO, is the liaison between the ESG, Base level group, and all other Contracting personnel. This team is responsible for developing and executing action plans based on the inputs from leadership, the contracting organization, and customers. Members will analyze, validate and formulate all data received into responses or action items.

The ESG monitors the progress of the project, provides necessary guidance and is the final decision authority for all project-related issues. This team is chaired by SAF/AQC, Brig Gen Frank Anderson. Membership is comprised of MAJCOM Chiefs of Contracting and an appropriate member from AFCQMI.

Planning

AFCQMI invited Maj Magazu to a project planning meeting at Randolph AFB TX on 23 September 1997. The purpose of this meeting was to familiarize SAF/AQCO with AFCQMI capabilities and to educate the AFCQMI cross-functional team with Contracting needs. Personnel with expertise in process consultation/assessments, ABC costing, management engineering, and modeling & simulation were in attendance. This facilitated a cross-flow of ideas and clarified methodologies employed by the Center's support branches that would provide the means for Contracting organizations to develop and implement a solid defensible product. Based on the information discussed at the meeting, the core team was able to develop a draft plan that would be presented to the ESG.

At the ESG workshop, hosted by AFCQMI on 28 October 1997, the group received an update on the organizational tests and the proposed milestones for other phases of the project. Goals of the session were to determine how to proceed with each phase of the study and to address any concerns of the testing organizations.

Resulting action items were: to propose an A-76 planning group meeting between XPM, AQC and DP to determine how to handle the "Jumpstart" initiatives; continue with implementation of the organizational tests; received approval for the execution of the internal, management, and customer world-wide web surveys; direction to proceed with development of IDEF and ABC models. Metrics development would be addressed at the Contracting World-wide Conference being held the following week. Finally, realizing that Contracting and the Air Force were changing rapidly, Gen Anderson recommended compressing the timeline from 24 months to 16-18 months.

AFMS Revision

The leading topic of discussion at the 13 August 1997 MAJCOM working group meeting was AFMS revisions. Decisions on several issues regarding AFMS variances needed to be analyzed and the results implemented immediately. The primary concerns were variances identified during the AFMS annual review: Contract Administration of A-76 Contracts, Quality Assurance Evaluator Program Coordinator (QAEPC) and IMPAC. Preliminary data was presented regarding changes in workload from commodities to IMPAC and impending A-76s. The group developed questionnaires for further data collection and insight to these issues.

AFCQMI validated the questionnaires by interviewing process experts at bases in the San Antonio area and proceeded to e-mail the MAJCOM representatives for Air Force-wide dissemination. The data collected for each variance concentrated on number of hours, number of transactions, current number of personnel working a task, and general comments needing to be addressed. A total of 65 bases responded to the data collection efforts.

IMPAC Program

The reengineering team compared the data for the three primary areas: training, administration, and surveillance. The data for each of the categories varied tremendously from base to base and reflected no correlation with the number of transactions or card holders. A weak correlation with base population was able to be established only after the elimination of several out-liers. As data collection efforts continued, the lack of standardization within IMPAC card holder training and surveillance methodology was identified.

The requirement for IMPAC surveillance is 100%. Varying interpretation of the needed frequency of occurrence ranged from actual yearly inspection of every record entry to 100% surveillance of reporting summary log “R90” addressing only those which present a problem. AFCQMI forwarded its findings to SAF/AQCO on 12 December 1997, and recommended establishing a standard way of accomplishing IMPAC administration, training and, most importantly, surveillance based upon cost and amount of risk the community is willing to accept. Until this occurs, an Air Force-wide requirement cannot be implemented, even though at many locations the requirement does exist. The solution, so far, for many of the bases has been to reallocate commodity positions to IMPAC administration.

QAE Program Coordinator

Currently the standard allows for a variance of +1 Air Force-wide for the QAEPC program administration. The data collected showed only three bases that would require more than one person for program administration, while 44 of the 65 bases sampled indicated the position required less than 100 hours per month. The recommendation was to leave the program as it is allowing those who need the variance to continue applying it.

Contract Administration

Currently, Contract Administration positions are earned after the contract is awarded, but the AFMS does not account for workload incurred during contract development. One of the reengineering team's tasks was to adjust the variance to account for this workload. As a related but separate issue, the team was asked to design a plan to address losses of Contract Administration positions due to varying interpretation of the QAE table in AFI 28-12.

During the data collection in August and September 1997, the data revealed of those who have been involved with A-76, only 12% of the positions earned through A-76 were allocated to contract administration. The remaining positions were used as QAEs within the functional area of study. This determination is made after the selection of the contractor.

As Air Force-wide A-76 initiatives were just beginning, many of the bases were unable to determine the number of impending A-76 studies. At the time, there was no plan as to how the MAJCOMs were individually going to implement the A-76 initiatives (base vs. MAJCOM working the issues.) The reengineering team recommended scheduling a meeting, which is projected to occur on 22 May 1998. At that time MAJCOM XPMs and LGCs will address all
A-76 related issues and help resolve some manpower considerations.

Organizational Test

Reorganization plans were developed and approved for representative test bases within HQ AFSPC, HQ AMC and HQ AFSOC. The reengineering team was tasked to develop metrics and any other data collection requirements necessary to measure the success of the tests. Interim progress reporting was scheduled to be accomplished quarterly. Data has been collected, reviewed and distributed to members of the ESG to ensure test goals are being met. At the conclusion of the test, the reengineering team will advise the affected MAJCOMs and provide a coordinated final report to SAF/AQC with recommendations for action.

Organizational Test Proposals

HQ AMC's approach reduces the number of flights from four to two, Operational Flight and Support Flight. This structure promises increased flexibility of the workforce to meet fluctuations in workload. It creates multiple Contracting Officer (CO) teams composed of four or more personnel based upon function, complexity or customer type. Also, for larger squadrons, it adds the option to use section leaders as managers for several CO teams.

HQ AFSPC & HQ AFSOC utilized a different approach than that of HQ AMC. It reduces the number of flights to three, Management Support, Base Infrastructure and Other Base Operating Support. Additionally, it incorporates the use of specialized flights, as needed. This structure aligns flight to major customer groups, provides supervisory opportunities and reduces span of control. It

may support more focused training within each flight and increase the breadth of experience.

Organizational Test Metrics

The primary task of the reengineering group that met at Peterson AFB, CO on 13 August 1997 was to determine and clarify the goals of the organizational test and develop metrics that would measure the effectiveness of the new structures. The group focused on three areas of organizational impact: supervisory, non-supervisory and external customer. The approved results of this exercise were then incorporated into a survey already being developed by HQ AFSPC with the assistance of Dr. Miriam Fultz of the United States Air Force Academy (USAFA).

The method of deployment for all surveys is via the SAF/AQC homepage hosted by the AFCQMI server. Once the raw data has been compiled, it is forwarded to Lt John Wright of the Air Force Logistics Management Agency (AFLMA) for analysis.

Survey results varied after the first collection and analysis. The external customer baseline assessment reflected positive results in all areas being sampled: outcomes/products, customer education, teamwork, timeliness, trust, job knowledge and communication/problem reoccurrence.

The initial collection of survey results establishes the baseline for subsequent surveys. Most categories scored in the upper four range, out of a maximum score of six. The exception to the resulting score is the career progression & retainability category, which scored low in both the supervisory and non-supervisory areas. Using the baseline, the team will compare the surveys conducted in April & October 1998 to see if any improvements or determents have occurred in the test organizations.

Mission Analysis

The reengineering team's next step was mission analysis. The objective of this activity was to develop a brief for SAF/AQC on the linkage between vision, mission, & goals of "Contracting 21 which was developed at the Contracting World-wide Conference. The organizational tests, Operational Contracting activities & processes, and other on-going initiatives within the Contracting community were integrated into the analysis process.

The process included the development and validation of an Integrated Definition (IDEF) model, expansion of the IDEF0 into the framework for an ABC model, and identification of key customers & key customer requirements. These tools and the assessment of the derived products led the teams into the development of fact-based business options.

IDEF0 Model Development/Validation

The purposes for using IDEF methodology, as opposed to other concepts, were that it enables standard communication, provides a graphical activity representation, separates activities from organization, facilitates consensus among team members, assists with identifying problems and deficiencies, forms a basis for further analysis and is more adaptable to the software required to accomplish ABC. In IDEF0 modeling, activities are ranked from the top down in order of scope. Activities are normally not displayed sequentially.

The purpose of this step was to graphically display all activities performed within Operational Contracting squadrons in order to determine the cost of doing business using ABC. Uses for this model and the ABC model derived from it, are multi-facetted to include: metric development, best practice determination, functional process improvement, and Operational Contracting management cost accounting system development.

A high-level, skeletal model was produced by AFCQMI based upon research already done by Headquarters Air Force Materiel Command (AFMC) and Army Forces Command (FORSCOM). A small working group composed of personnel from Lackland AFB, TX and AETC/LGC was tasked to adjust the hierarchical model to better depict the activities as they are performed within a generalized Operational Contracting squadron.

The base level working group assembled for the first time at Randolph AFB TX on 17 November 1997. The tasking was to expound upon earlier labors by identifying and validating squadron level activities and further developing those ideas. The principal deliverable to the MAJCOM group was model content and not the diagram itself. This included activities with descriptions and inputs, controls, outputs, & mechanisms (ICOMs) with definitions. Workshop methodology employed was to develop the model by reaching consensus on the model purpose, viewpoint, context (scope), external products/services, ICOMs, glossary definitions and activity decompositions (breakdowns).

“Perform Operational Contracting” is the highest level activity of the diagram. At a glance, this diagram provides a high level view of the ICOMs on the Operational Contracting activity. Sole input to the activity was identified as Customer need. As defined, this ICOM represents everything entering the activity. Controls on the activity depend upon the directives/standards and mission. Because directives/standards encompasses all regulations, policy letters, operating instructions, etc., this control affects all activities within the model. Outputs of the activity include: mission capable unit type code (UTC) package, management information system (MIS) information, external customer trained, simplified acquisition, contract and other. Mechanisms identified during the workshop were viewed as personnel, supplies, and systems/equipment. Additionally, this node diagram contains notes that apply to various activities.

The second level consists of 5 major activities that further define what an Operational Contracting Squadron accomplishes: Perform Acquisition, Conduct Training, Perform System Management, Provide Contingency Support, and Perform Overhead/Administration Support. Since "Perform Acquisitions" has been identified as the principal Contracting activity, it naturally warrants a high level of placement within the node. All other activities lend themselves to support of the acquisitions activity as inputs, controls or mechanisms. In addition to the internal sustainment provided to performing acquisitions, they contribute to the performance of Operational Contracting by providing high level outputs to external customers respectively: External Customer Trained, UTC Package, MIS Information and Other.

Once the model was accomplished, the original mini-working group from San Antonio was assigned the task of developing a dictionary that would further define all activities and ICOMs within the model. The reason for this was to enable any reader to examine the content of the model without having to look at a wiring diagram.

The activities, analysis of, and recommendations apply to peacetime operations (to include pre- and post-deployment activities) in AMC, ACC, USAFE, PACAF, AETC, AFSPC, USAFA, the 11th Wing (Bolling AFB, DC) and AFSOC. It does not apply to the Air National Guard (ANG), the Air Force Reserve (AFRES), or contracting flights that have been cost compared (under OMB Circular A-76). They will apply to AFMC only if AFMC converts its current organizational structure divisions to Operational Contracting squadrons.

On 15 December 1997, the MAJCOM working group met at Hurlburt Fld, FL. The principal tasking was to review and validate the IDEF0 model and identify performance measures based on those activities performed within Operational Contracting. Workshop deliverables included: a finalized IDEF model, performance measures (quantitative) for development of the ABC model, identified strengths & weaknesses (S&Ws), identified activities for qualitative measurement, and recommended next steps.

While validating the IDEF0 model, the team utilized the same methodology used to develop the draft model with one exception. The group's assignment was to validate what the base level group built and to mature the descriptions and definitions. No extreme changes were made to the representation. As final commentary in reference to the IDEF0 model, the MAJCOM group lauded the base level group's efforts in putting together a comprehensive document that captured the high-level acquisition activities in such a short period of time.

The next effort was to identify the strengths & weaknesses of each major activity. After significant debate, the team decided they were not close enough to the process to provide an accurate field assessment. The logical conclusion was another meeting of the base level working group to flesh out these details.

ABC Model Development

During the MAJCOM validation of the activity model Capt Wallen, AFCQMI, briefed the benefits of ABC, and its implementation at Army FORSCOM bases to include Operational Contracting, and the implementation at AFMC/PK. Capt Wallen suggested a contractor could be hired to implement ABC or through AFCQMI and contracting personnel. The group decided to hold further development until cost associated and personnel resources needed were identified and allow AQC to decide which direction to proceed.

In January 1998, Capt Wallen presented the costing information for implementation and development Air Force-wide. Based on these figures, SAF/AQC decided that AFMC would be the mission area champion for ABC and once their system was implemented, it would be adapted to the other commands operational contracting squadrons.

As of 15 April 1998 AFMC had prepared initial statistics of their ABC effort in terms of manpower and the results achieved. Their initial personnel requirements were extensive due to the program's infancy, but they were able to identify areas for improvement to include: standardizing data collection methods, automating more of the process, improving the use of ABC software, defining frequencies, developing meaningful reports. In addition to these improvements, several areas of the reengineering action team's model would need to expand beyond the current AFMC model. These areas included training, contingency and systems management. In order to gain insight of the benefits, we would recommend visiting FORSCOM to incorporate both models into the Operational Contracting Squadron.

Current Capabilities Assessment

In order to meet the MAJCOM group's call for this assessment, the base level team assembled in San Antonio, TX again on 26 January 1998. In addition to the Contracting membership, customers from San Antonio bases were in attendance to provide their unique perspective of the acquisition processes.

Using the IDEF0 model, strategic plan, and customer survey results from the organizational test, the team identified key customers, key customer requirements and the S&Ws of current Operational Contracting Activities. For this exercise, key customers and key customer requirements were defined as customers and requirements that demanded a significant amount of time and attention on the part of the Contracting specialist. In addition to the identification process, the group categorized and prioritized the S&Ws by key results areas described in "Contracting 21": Leadership, People, Process, Product, and Service ($LEAP^3S$).

As an additive, SAF/AQCO recommended that this workshop produce alternative organizational options outside of what has already been offered by the organizational test. After a valiant attempt,

the group came to the conclusion that there was not enough leadership guidance and research material available to achieve this end. Recommendations were to ask SAF/AQC and the other leading reengineering groups to further detail the vision set forth by "Contracting 21" respectively: future customers, future customer requirements, and detailed definition of what the role business advisor would entail.

Opportunity Research & Development

As a result of the call for leadership guidance from the base level group, a leadership decision to move the study forward at a more accelerated pace, and information derived from Annual Planning & Programming Guidance (APPG), a hybrid workshop was conducted. With representation of all MAJCOMs and select members from the base level group, this meeting was the beginning of an essential and pivotal step of the project. The purpose of this workshop was to develop and analyze notional organizational options to be presented to the ESG on 23 April 1998.

The initial effort was to brief some organizational concepts developed by SAF/AQCO, add to them, and/or address other concepts offered by the group. The workshop members developed criteria to assess the proposals, categorized weaknesses list from the previous base level meeting by identifying what weaknesses each proposal would alleviate, and brainstormed more radical changes that would be feasible.

The final exercise was to develop an action plan. The group was tasked to come to consensus on what approach to take to validate the Operational Contracting Process. Organization needs to fit the process. While doing the weakness assessment, it was noted that the structures did not address or improve approximately 75% of the weaknesses. This identified the need to take a hard look at the processes. Most breaks in the processes are not caused by the current organizational structure. This lead the group back the question of whether or not the structure needed to change. Another reason for intense examination of the acquisition processes was the requirement for the development of a new AFMS.

All members left the workshop understanding that Contracting needs to develop the case for change that will be briefed to the Air corporate board. Since support for the warfighter is shifting from organic support to including more of a mix with contract support, this organization will need to change structure in order to obtain the flexibility in workforce and increase grades commensurate with the complexity of work. This change should take into account the changes in the acquisition process that brought the need for change about.

<u>Organizational Assessment Criteria Development</u>

Using Group Systems, the group developed a list of criteria to evaluate organizational proposals. The questions were then grouped into different categories, incorporating KRAs. The criteria was applied for each proposed organizational option, as well as insuring it met the requirements set forth

by AFI 38-101. This would enable leadership to assess the feasibility of each option.

Some critical issues included: increases/decreases of grades, skill levels, series, etc. for civilian, officers, and enlisted; identification of laws and regulations that would need to adapt to facilitate organizational change; overseas unique environment; and MAJCOM-unique philosophies' impact on a new structure. Each of these issues must be addressed in order to avoid disrupting the reengineering process.

Structure Development

The workshop was divided into two groups tasked to brainstorm alternative organizational structures. Each group briefed their ideas. After significant amounts of discussion and proposal adjustment, the team agreed to submit five notional options.

Modular Squadron. The first option discussed was the implementation of a Modular Squadron. It adds the workforce flexibility that is the key to meeting mission requirements, which is the largest complaint with the current dictated organization. This option uses a three-tiered organization composed of a command section, flights (Support Flight and Contracting Flights) and teams dedicated to certain customer bases. The personnel requirement for each modular flight would be based on mission, number of customers, etc. This promises to be an 80% solution that would satisfy the squadron and customer needs at both bases.

Acquisition Activity. An Acquisition Activity reporting directly to the wing commander was another proposal. The unit commander would be an acquisition commander responsible for two primary areas: Program Management Office (PMO) and Contracting Office (CO). The Air Force Specialty Code of the position does not necessarily need to be a 64XX. The PMO would have QAE-type (Performance Managers), Resource Advisors and would work directly with the CO for administration and future contract development. The subordinate contracting structure would take on a structure similar to the Modular Squadron. This proposal was deemed most appropriate of outsourced bases.

Regionalization. Regionalization by geographic location was disputed based on history and perceived lack responsiveness to the customer. It is an office with detachments (DETs) existing at the local bases. The regional office would report to a single MAJCOM. Advantages are that it cuts across command lines, it is mission focused, and it is within close proximity of the supported bases.

Additional Regionalization Options. MAJCOM regionalization would centralize common contracts at headquarters level to be administered at base level. Mission unique or location specific contracts would still be accomplished at base level. Another option would be regionalization by task, which would be more as a means of contract procurement and would not require reorganization.

Outsourcing. Finally, the group discussed outsourcing Operational Contracting. This option would leave a small contingent at each base doing performance management and all Acquisition Contracting Office (ACO) functions. It would be feasible when there is one base operating support contractor with a Cost Plus incentive contract. An example of this would be the Vance and Arnold engineering models.

Other Issues

Maj Magazu asked Lupe Beckett of the 37th CONS at Lackland AFB, TX to champion the alignment of identified weakness with the goals contained in "Contracting 21". This product will be forwarded to SAF/AQCO for distribution to each goal's Mission Area Champion (MAC). The MACs will be asked to address each issue and provide feedback to the field.

Methodology Recommendations

The ESG will select a base considered ideal representation of how Operational Contracting processes should be performed. Representatives from AFCQMI and Contracting will visit this site to develop a flow-process model of the Acquisition processes to include: Acquisition Planning, Presolicitation, Solicitation/Award, and Post-award processes. The results of this effort will be briefed and expounded upon in the development workshop.

The reengineering team is recommending a follow-up process development workshop. At this meeting, members will validate and clarify the Contracting/Acquisition process. Approximately 50 people representing all stakeholders will be in attendance to include: SAF/AQC, Strategic Plan MACs, AF/ILE, AF/ILS, AF/ILV, SAF/DP and SAF/FM personnel. Length of this workshop will be one week.

The purpose for having such large representation is multi-faceted. The IDEF0 model defines Contracting's major activities as Perform Acquisitions, Conduct Training, Perform Systems Management, Provide Contingency Support, and Provide Overhead/Administrative Support. Since acquisitions is the primary function of Contracting Squadrons, it would be the logical candidate for high-level flow processing. At the same time, there are several reengineering initiatives already occurring in reference to the other support activities listed. The goal would be the incorporation of those initiatives into the primary project. Also, since all other listed organizations have a vested interest in the outcome of this effort, they will be able to provide input to the process and assess the impact of the reengineering initiative on their own processes. Customers would attend to ensure their interests are being addressed.

The group will begin this effort by providing updates on all reegineering and improvement initiatives. Process validation will occur in break-out sessions which will require daily progress reports to ensure continuity of process. The ESG will remain in executive session during the break-out periods and provide guidance during group sessions.

As a result of the first meeting, tiger teams will be formed to further develop processes that could not be fully detailed. Team goals require the collection of needed information and validation of how contracting processes are accomplished across the Air Force. Teams will also utilize customer survey data to assess concerns as the processes are defined. All data collected, combined with customer requirements and resource constraints, will also be used to refine the organizational assessment criteria.

The team has programmed a three-month recess between July and October 1998 for year-end program execution. During this break, the core team with assistance of members of the reengineering action teams will conduct further collection efforts to assess benchmarking, incremental improvement and reengineering opportunities.

As sessions begin again in October, the tiger teams will brief the results of the benchmarking, improvement, and reengineering efforts to deconflict inconsistencies and to address processes needing further information and customer issues. The ultimate goal is to establish new methodologies and processes. A group of 30-35 team members and selected working group personnel are expected to be in attendance.

Developed options will be briefed to Air Force Corporate Structure for approval. The approved organizational option with reengineered processes will require a follow-on manpower determinant workshop. A trial impact application by all MAJCOMs would be required to certify the draft AFMS before its final approval.